



312066 0271 2965 1

BOARD OF REGENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Affiliation or Merger Between
Massachusetts Maritime Academy and
Southeastern Massachusetts University:
A Discussion and Proposal

A Report
to the Board of Regents

December 1989

AFFILIATION OR MERGER BETWEEN MASSACHUSETTS MARITIME ACADEMY
AND SOUTHEASTERN MASSACHUSETTS UNIVERSITY:
A DISCUSSION AND PROPOSAL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At its June 1989 meeting the Board of Regents of Higher Education authorized and directed Chancellor Franklyn G. Jenifer to "provide a detailed plan analyzing a potential merger or appropriate affiliation between Southeastern Massachusetts University and Massachusetts Maritime Academy." The Regents also requested a plan from the Academy's Board of Trustees outlining its proposal for the campus's future as a free-standing institution. This paper fulfills the Board's charge by examining various "models" for an affiliation or merger of the Maritime Academy with the University, and identifying one particular approach as preferable to the others that are reviewed. It does not recommend a merger/affiliation, in the specified form or in general; rather, it starts with that premise, and presents a discussion and a specific proposal for the Board's consideration along with the Academy's own plan. The intent of the paper is to present a general sense of what the affiliation or merger could "look like" and how it might work, while avoiding speculative discussion of matters that can be worked out only in practice.

Affiliation is considered in two forms, designated "consortial" and "institutionalized"; both are basically conservative approaches, tending to limit duplication at the expense of limiting constructive developments as well. Merger presents a broader range of possibilities for governance, administration, academic program, and institutional character. The study reviews four basic models before presenting the preferred option:

- A. The Maritime Academy would be administratively part of SMU, but essentially intact otherwise.

- B. The Buzzards Bay campus would be closed and its programs transferred to the SMU campus, where the maritime cadet corps would be somewhat analogous to an ROTC program.
- C. The Maritime Academy would be maintained as a school of the University, but the Buzzards Bay site would become a general campus with an array of SMU programs accessible to the growing population on Cape Cod.
- D. The Buzzards Bay campus of SMU would retain a clear focus on marine-related programs, of which the uniformed maritime cadet program would be one component -- as at Texas A & M University at Galveston.

The Massachusetts Maritime College of Southeastern Massachusetts University: A Proposal

The preferred form for a merger/affiliation between the Massachusetts Maritime Academy and Southeastern Massachusetts University, a version of Option D, maintains the professional maritime program within an academic structure that allows for dynamic evolution in the future. This approach achieves key goals identified by the consultant team, notably provision of "civilian" academic leadership, a broadened program array, and accommodation of greater student diversity; it preserves the unique institutional character that the Academy's loyal supporters, and the Regents themselves, are concerned to sustain; and it permits all of the economic benefits of savings, efficiency improvements, and resource-sharing that are possible under any of the options.

The Massachusetts Maritime Academy would be merged into Southeastern Massachusetts University, under its President and an enlarged Board of Trustees. The professional maritime program would become a college of the University (the Massachusetts Maritime College of Southeastern Massachusetts University), with its own dean and faculty, similar to the five existing colleges. The corps of cadets would continue, retaining its distinctive uniformed character, and disciplinary system. The Buzzards Bay campus would be, for the foreseeable future, a campus with a

predominant marine emphasis; other marine-related activities, new or relocated from North Dartmouth (including perhaps SMU's Coastal Zone Research Laboratory) would join the maritime program, fostering synergy in the emerging marine fields that are the state's maritime future. The campus would also provide a base for general continuing-education program offerings serving the growing Cape Cod area, to be coordinated with programs of Cape Cod Community College.

Collective Bargaining Issues arising from the merger must be resolved through negotiations between the Regents and the unions involved, with the University and the Academy parties to the discussion. The issues do not appear intractable.


Financial Impacts of an MMA-SMU merger must be separated into long-term and short-term effects. Merger will produce long-term savings in several senses: elimination of current and future duplications, fuller use of available resources and realization of economies of scale through resource-sharing, and development of new high-return programs in marine-related fields. Immediate savings, under any scenario including outright closure of the Academy, are difficult to achieve, and virtually impossible to predict.

Regional Possibilities for maritime education, through some form of affiliation with one (or more) of the other maritime academies, are beyond the scope of this paper, and could only be addressed through interstate negotiations. A merger of the Academy into SMU would preclude neither further consideration of this option nor implementation of consortial relationships with similar schools in other states, and might in some respects enhance the prospects for such cooperation.

AFFILIATION OR MERGER BETWEEN MASSACHUSETTS MARITIME ACADEMY
AND SOUTHEASTERN MASSACHUSETTS UNIVERSITY:
A DISCUSSION AND PROPOSAL

At its meeting on June 13, 1989, the Board of Regents of Higher Education authorized and directed Chancellor Franklyn G. Jenifer to "provide a detailed plan analyzing a potential merger or appropriate affiliation between Southeastern Massachusetts University and Massachusetts Maritime Academy." At the same time, the Regents requested a plan from the Academy's Board of Trustees outlining its proposal for the campus's future as a free-standing institution. The discussion preceding the vote reflected the Board's concern with governance, administrative, and academic issues involved in an affiliation or merger, and also with the more elusive matter of institutional character. The Regents were clear in their commitment to maintaining the professional program in maritime studies now offered by the Academy, and to preserving the uniformed, disciplined corps of cadets as a key component of that distinctive program.

The present paper fulfills the Board's charge by examining various "models" for an affiliation or merger of the Maritime Academy with the University, and identifying one particular approach as preferable to the others that are reviewed. It does not recommend a merger/affiliation, in the specified form or in general; rather, it starts with the assumption that a merger or affiliation is desirable, and develops a specific proposal for



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013 with funding from
Boston Library Consortium Member Libraries

<http://archive.org/details/affiliationormer00mass>

the Board's consideration along with the Academy's own plan. The intent of the paper is to present a general sense of what the affiliation or merger could "look like" and how it might work, while avoiding speculative discussion of matters that can be worked out only in practice. Its emphasis, therefore, is on fundamental issues of institutional character, program array and governance as opposed to detailed administrative analysis or implementation strategies.

Affiliation

In an affiliation arrangement, the Academy would retain its legal institutional autonomy, with its own president and board of trustees. Governance in its narrower sense would not be an issue; there would, however, be a formal interinstitutional structure promoting coordination between the Academy and the University. The existing systemwide oversight processes of the Board of Regents in such areas as strategic planning and new program approval would be made more specific and directive so as to enforce the desired level of collaboration between these particular institutions. In the "stronger" form of affiliation (or "institutionalized affiliation") this formal structure might extend beyond administrative coordination to joint institutional operations.

A. Consortial Affiliation

The simpler form of affiliation would be, in effect, a two-campus consortium, with most of the familiar characteristics of a consortium. (The arrangement might be extended to embrace other public higher education institutions with overlapping missions or service areas, notably Cape Cod Community College and Bridgewater State College.) The most important medium of affiliation would be a joint academic council, which would work out agreements for cross-registration, course coordination, and joint program development. Marine-related continuing education and marine engineering courses would be obvious fields for initial academic collaboration; possibilities for joint research efforts have been examined by the external consultant team. Measures to facilitate cross-registration would significantly broaden the range of courses available to Maritime students in particular. Formal affiliation would also be likely to lead to further collaboration in academic support and administrative areas -- for example, coordinated library development, sharing of computing resources and other specialized equipment (including perhaps vessels), joint purchasing, shared plant maintenance personnel, and so on.

The moderate broadening of the Academy's degree program offerings proposed by the expert study team would be possible under an affiliation with SMU; the terms of the affiliation would constrain the addition of new MMA programs, but might open further opportunities for collaborative offerings. A consortial affiliation could even be stretched far enough to allow siting of

SMU's Coastal Zone Research Laboratory on the MMA campus, although this would certainly be less complicated if the institutions were merged.

Experience demonstrates that a consortium can provide valuable benefits from cooperation while preserving the differentiated characters of the participating campuses. A case in point is the Five College consortium, which includes the University of Massachusetts at Amherst and four nearby private liberal arts colleges. This is a well-established and very "intense" collaboration, extending to consortial degree programs, among institutions which differ profoundly in size, program, student selectivity, control and governance. Not only have the campuses retained their distinctive characteristics, but a new college (Hampshire) of unique character has developed within the consortium.

The same experience also reminds us that successful consortial affiliations grow organically -- they cannot be "legislated" from without. This is especially true of academic programs, which depend upon interinstitutional collaboration among faculty members. Personal acquaintance and professional regard seem much more important than, for example, shared collective bargaining status in promoting cooperation. Despite the institutional differences among the Five Colleges, their faculty and administrators generally share common professional outlooks and live and work within a relatively compact community; this is less true of the proposed SMU-MMA affiliation, and neither party to the proposed arrangement has expressed great

interest in it. On the other hand, it should be noted that SMU has demonstrated its willingness to undertake collaborative programs in mounting joint degree offerings with Bridgewater State College, as well as in providing computing support to MMA.

A further possible drawback to affiliation is the risk that, if a flourishing collaboration does not develop, the arrangement will instead tend to place both institutions in what might be called defensive postures. In this eventuality, affiliation might become for both parties more valuable as an assurance of preservation of the status quo than as for its promotion of desirable change.

Compared to other available options, therefore, a consortial affiliation represents an extremely conservative approach to the Academy's future, in three respects:

- o First, it involves only marginal changes in governance structures;
- o Second, it makes any significant academic or administrative collaboration within the resulting consortium dependent upon development of consensus among the parties, under circumstances which are not ideally conducive to such initiatives;
- o Third, in default of joint program development by the two institutions, the tendency of affiliation will probably be to constrain their individual initiative and evolution -- the Academy's addition of curricula outside the maritime

field as such, and the University's development within the marine field where it plans to build distinctive strengths.

If the highest priority of the Board of Regents is to preserve the existing strengths of the Academy, with a secondary concern for avoiding program duplication, affiliation may be the best approach. In this case, future development of coordinated academic programs, of new collaborative programs, or of cost savings through resource-sharing would be desirable, but not determinative of the success of the plan. If, by contrast, the Board is principally concerned to effect improvements in the Academy, and to lay to rest persistent doubts about its future, affiliation is less likely than other approaches -- either merger or "pure" autonomy -- to yield a satisfactory resolution.

B. Institutionalized Affiliation

Some of the weaknesses of a consortial affiliation are remedied in a "stronger" form of affiliation, which might be called an institutionalized affiliation. In this arrangement each campus would retain its autonomous governance, but a special organizational entity would be established to develop and conduct programs of instruction, research and service in specified fields, involving both institutions. An apt analogy from the business world might be the establishment by corporations of joint ventures in emerging fields of mutual interest. In the present case, this would most appropriately take the form of a

unit of the university (SMU) explicitly charged to work with the specialized institution (MMA).

For example, a "Massachusetts Institute of Marine Studies" might be constituted as part of SMU, drawing upon the University's existing marine-related programs and its prospective Coastal Zone Research Laboratory. The Institute could be planned "from the ground up" to incorporate the same range of joint MMA-SMU activities that would be possible under a "consortial" affiliation. As a result, developments that would be basically adventitious in a less formal consortium would be far more likely to come about. The Academy's incentive for collaboration to broaden its program would remain, while the University's interest in joint action would be enhanced. The probability of effective collaboration would be highest if the Maritime Academy and the SMU Institute occupied the same campus.

This type of affiliation is considerably less conservative, in the terms outlined above, than the simpler consortial type. It does not alter the governance structures of the participating institutions, and would thus tend to protect the integrity of the Academy's special character. At the same time, it creates within the University a new entity with a stake in collaboration, and considerable power to bring new programs into being. The approach avoids some of the most serious drawbacks of conventional collaboration, without taking the fundamental and irrevocable step of merger. Yet there is significant risk involved even in this intermediate solution. Unlike a looser association, it does imply structural change in one or both institutions, locking them into their relationship; thus, a high

premium is placed upon accurate initial identification of appropriate fields for fruitful collaboration.

Merger

As compared to affiliation, merger presents a much broader range of possibilities for, and a much greater degree of control over governance, administration, academic program, and institutional character. The organic development of working relationships remains crucial, but its course and pace is determined in large measure by the structure within which it occurs. Policy and program decisions that might not be possible in an arrangement depending entirely upon consensus among independent bodies can be made in a merged organization; among other things, this implies that the long-term evolution of the institution is difficult to predict.

Even in the short run, the correlation between the formal structure of governance and the vital but elusive reality of campus character and culture is hardly straightforward. The accommodation of separate staffs, academic units, and collective bargaining entities within a unified structure involves complexities that can hardly be identified, much less resolved, on an a priori basis. For the present purpose, therefore, it is most practical to think of structure as dependent upon character. The following sections examine several general models for the future of the Maritime campus under a merger and address the specific administrative arrangements that would support our curricular and cultural goals.

A. "Massachusetts Maritime Academy of SMU"

At one extreme of the range of possible configurations for a post-merger Massachusetts Maritime Academy stands an obvious and well-known example: the Academy as it exists today. The Massachusetts Maritime Academy is a free-standing campus, "more like a polytechnic institute than a liberal arts college." All of its students (numbering from 600 to 800 in recent years) are full-time undergraduates, uniformed members of a corps of cadets under quasi-military discipline. Top administrators too are in uniform, though this is no longer generally true of the faculty and staff. All students must reside in on-campus dormitories. The Academy's four-year program, which includes substantial sea time, leads to the baccalaureate in either Marine Transportation or Marine Engineering (with various related minors) and a Merchant Marine Officer's License. Although the curriculum is oriented toward the seagoing professions, and (alone among state academies) lacks ABET accreditation, most of the Academy's alumni find work ashore; and because of their expertise and discipline, they are highly prized by employers. Persistent criticisms of the Academy have focused on its conservative curriculum, declining enrollment, and high per-student cost; the apparent lack of attraction of its unique campus culture for minorities and women; and the fact that the maritime industries it was created to serve are depressed nationally and virtually moribund in Massachusetts. At present the Commonwealth is operating the most "traditional" academy, with the largest cadet corps, of any

state, even though traditional maritime industries are less significant here than in any other state with a maritime academy.

It is possible to devise a "merger" with SMU that would leave the Maritime Academy essentially intact. The Academy's head (perhaps a "commandant" or "superintendent") would report directly to the University president. Beyond the representation of its interests on the University board of trustees, a statutory visiting committee and a separate "line" in the higher education budget would protect the Academy's identity. Maritime faculty would be covered by special provisions of the SMU collective bargaining agreement, as they now are under the State College contract. (Some of these points are discussed at greater length in the final section of the paper.) Under these circumstances, program expansion at the Maritime campus would be difficult, and the status quo might be seen to serve all institutional interests.

B. "The Massachusetts Maritime Program at SMU"

The opposite extreme of the range of merger possibilities is a situation in which the uniformed maritime cadet corps is simply one component of the student body on a general university campus. This is presumably what would result from a merger in which the maritime program was transferred to the main SMU campus in North Dartmouth, with the Buzzards Bay campus sold or converted to other public uses. There is some similarity between this outcome and the status of ROTC, in which a minority of students are

enrolled in a uniformed program; but the analogy is far from exact.

The closest existing parallel in the maritime field is the Great Lakes Maritime Academy, which offers a three-year associate degree program at Northwestern Michigan College, a community college in Traverse City, Michigan. GLMA is, however, the least typical of all maritime academies, and its sponsorship by six states is the least of its differences from the others. The cadet program, which is supported by the Maritime Administration, is directed toward inland shipping, and places students on commercial vessels rather than using an training ship. (The latter also true, incidentally, of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.) Cadets are a small minority on the Northern Michigan campus. They wear uniforms but share dormitories with non-cadets, and are not under strict military discipline. Although GLMA is apparently the least costly of maritime programs, its attenuated character makes it an unattractive model in the eyes of most maritime educators.

This viewpoint is evident in the comments of the visiting team, and especially Admiral Miller's minority report, about the disadvantages of locating marine programs on general campuses. The expert group was, in its majority, skeptical of the benefits of "military" (i.e., nonacademic) leadership for maritime campuses, and it recommended opening the MMA campus to "civilian" students, as has been done at Admiral Miller's New York Maritime College. At the same time, the consultants agreed that maintenance of a disciplined corps of cadets should be a central

consideration in determining the Academy's future shape. This concern is clearly shared by the Board of Regents as well.

C. A Cape Cod Branch of SMU

The Regents' Policy and Planning Committee meeting on the study team report also heard a presentation from President John Brazil of SMU sketching out some potential advantages of an MMA-SMU merger. The statement offered cogent arguments for the general benefits that could accrue to the Commonwealth from a merger, and particularly the potential value of the Academy site as a base for extending broader educational services to the fast-growing Cape Cod region. The President also made several strong points bearing directly upon the future of the professional maritime training program within the University, effectively countering some of the doubts raised by the consultants.

President Brazil argued that changing the leadership and programs of the Academy, as proposed by the study team, would incur substantial costs and might well undermine, rather than preserve, its characteristic strengths. Merger with SMU, by contrast, would prevent costly program duplication in the future, and could allow some consolidation of existing programs. Educational resources for students at both institutions would be enhanced; cadets would benefit not only from broader general education opportunities, but also from improved preparation for nonmaritime career fields. Further efficiencies would arise from shared administrative services, and from full utilization of the Academy's campus and resources.

The consultant group suggested that the maritime program would lose its character within the University, but President Brazil made the reverse argument. Whereas the consultants focused on the possible atrophy of the cadet program, he noted that a merger would stabilize overall campus enrollment, shielding the Academy from the effects of fluctuating demand maritime industries. SMU's colleges, he pointed out, are semi-autonomous, and this structure would allow the Academy to retain its distinctiveness. Maritime student recruitment would be strengthened, not diluted, by inclusion in the University's statewide efforts.

The plan outlined in President Brazil's statement envisions maintaining the Maritime Academy on the Buzzards Bay campus as a school of the University; it would, however, be only one of a number of SMU programs on the campus, which would house an array of academic offerings accessible to the growing population on Cape Cod. In this concept, representing the University's initial direct response to the possibility of merger, the present Maritime campus could itself become a general campus. Subsequent discussions with Regents' staff indicate that SMU would be prepared to contemplate, as part of final merger arrangement, a somewhat more focused maritime mission for the Buzzards Bay campus. (This option is incorporated in the preferred merger model, described below.)

D. "Southeastern Massachusetts University Marine Campus"

A fourth possibility is a campus with a clear focus on marine-related programs, but where the uniformed maritime cadet program is only one part -- and perhaps a relatively small part -- of the overall program array. An existing example of this model is Texas A & M University at Galveston (TAMUG), "the marine and maritime component of The Texas A & M University System." The Galveston campus includes two schools: the Moody College of Marine Technology, offering core courses and baccalaureate programs in Marine Biology, Marine Science, and Marine Fisheries; and the Texas Maritime College, with baccalaureate programs in Marine Transportation, Marine Engineering, Maritime Administration, and Maritime Systems Engineering. (The Marine Engineering program is ABET-accredited.) The campus coordinates all System programs in the Galveston area, and its Coastal Zone Laboratory is responsible for the University's marine-related research, advisory, and extension activity. Graduate programs in Biology and in Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences are conducted at Galveston under the auspices of departments on the main (College Station) campus. Total student enrollment at Texas A & M University at Galveston is approximately 600.

The Galveston campus is a full-fledged state maritime academy in the eyes of the U.S. Maritime Administration, receiving the same federal support as its counterparts elsewhere: a training vessel, funds for ship maintenance, a \$100,000 annual allocation for operating costs, and stipends for a limited number of cadets.

Four of the seven degree programs (the first two mentioned for each college) can lead to Merchant Marine licensure for qualified U.S. Maritime Service cadets. All Marine Transportation majors (who are ordinarily U.S. Maritime Service selectees) are candidates for licensure; in other fields the licensure component is an option, and a majority of students do not participate in the corps. The corps of cadets program includes the usual provisions for developing self-discipline, leadership, and management skills, such as prescribed uniforms, musters, watch standing, maintenance responsibilities, and special disciplinary procedures. All license-option students are required to live on campus, as are all unmarried students not residing at home in the Galveston area.

The Galveston campus is one of four in the Texas A & M University System, each headed by a president. The System has a single board, and is headed by a chancellor. TAMUG is nevertheless a branch of the Main (College Station) campus not only at the graduate level, but also in that its degrees are awarded through the Main Campus. Administrators and faculty (except in Naval Science -- NROTC) at TAMUG are civilians; there is a Commandant of the Corps of Cadets within the Student Services office.

Texas A & M University at Galveston and Massachusetts Maritime Academy are roughly the same size in enrollment and staffing, and strikingly similar in appearance. (The most obvious visual difference is the Massachusetts school's football field.) Both offer maritime licensure programs, with federal

Maritime Administration support. If MMA became, like TAMUG, a part of a general university system, its future would, in all probability, follow the Galveston model to some extent. In fact the Texas campus already has some of the developments that have been proposed for MMA, including degree program offerings, extension services, and a coastal zone laboratory.

* * * *

The Massachusetts Maritime College of Southeastern Massachusetts
University: A Proposal

The most desirable form of affiliation or merger between the Massachusetts Maritime Academy and Southeastern Massachusetts University would be a configuration along the general lines of the Texas model, suitably adapted to our own circumstances. The adaptation would take into account a number of respects in which Texas A & M University at Galveston (TAMUG) does not provide a readily transferrable model for MMA's future; two of these, at least, are very important considerations. One is inherent in institutional and geographic scale: TAMUG is a branch of a main campus with an enrollment of nearly 40,000, located over 100 miles away, whereas SMU, with 6,000 students, is within easy driving distance of the Maritime Academy. Under these circumstances, the relationship between the two Massachusetts campuses would certainly evolve differently, even under a similar governance structure. The second point of divergence is the strong commitment evinced in Massachusetts to maintaining the distinctive character of the uniformed maritime program. Taken together, these two factors suggest that in merging MMA with SMU we can set as our goal a fuller integration between the main and "maritime" campuses than exists in Texas, and at the same time preserve a stronger identity for the maritime program itself.

The fundamental advantage of this version of affiliation or merger is that it maintains the professional maritime program,

preserving its characteristic strengths, within an academic structure that allows for dynamic evolution in the future. Both models of affiliation, and the arrangement presented as Merger Option A, are essentially protective of the status quo. They effectively limit duplication and conflict between the two institutions, at the potential cost of limiting constructive possibilities as well. Merger Options B and C, on the other hand, provide less assurance that the maritime program will continue in its academic aspects, and create circumstances that are very likely to vitiate its professional and disciplinary character. The preferred approach achieves key goals identified by the consultant team, notably provision of "civilian" academic leadership, a broadened program array, and accommodation of greater student diversity; it preserves the unique institutional character that the Academy's loyal supporters, and the Regents themselves, are concerned to sustain; and it permits all of the economic benefits of savings, efficiency improvements, and resource-sharing that are possible under any of the options.

This solution avoids the most extreme possibilities and satisfies a range of goals for the Academy's future, yet it is not an artificial compromise position. It meets the demands of the situation because it represents a coherent structure with its own integrity, readily identifiable and understood in the American academic context. The status of a professional school within a university, with its own distinguishing characteristics, is a common one. In the maritime education field, the proposed arrangement lies within the existing range of schools, closer to

the most traditional pattern than is the Texas Maritime College; there can be no question that this structure would meet existing or future federal standards for state maritime programs.

General Configuration and Program

The Massachusetts Maritime Academy would be merged into Southeastern Massachusetts University. The professional maritime program would be given the status of a separate college of the university (the Massachusetts Maritime College of Southeastern Massachusetts University), with its own dean and faculty. The corps of cadets would continue, retaining its distinctive uniformed character, and disciplinary system.

A merger on the model proposed here would allow continuation of the undergraduate professional maritime programs currently offered by the Academy, with significant improvement in the range of liberal arts courses available to students. It would greatly facilitate the development of closely related programs drawing upon the University's existing resources in such fields as marine sciences, engineering, and management; some programs of this sort have been proposed by the Academy during the past two years. In the longer term, it would allow the development of new types of programs in response to the evolution of marine-related economic activities in the Commonwealth.

The Buzzards Bay campus would be, for the foreseeable future, a campus with a predominant marine emphasis; the maritime program would be joined by other marine-related activities, new or

relocated from North Dartmouth. For example, it now appears likely that Buzzards Bay can provide a suitable location for SMU's Coastal Zone Research Laboratory, combining the advantages of an on-campus and a waterfront site. The non-cadet marine programs could include service and research functions as well as graduate and undergraduate instruction, and might be constituted as a second school or an institute. This approach would reinforce, to some extent, the distinctive character of the campus, and mitigate forces that might undermine the discipline of the cadet corps. At the same time, it would promote cooperation among programs on the campus in the emerging marine fields that are the state's maritime future. The campus would also provide a base for general continuing-education program offerings serving the growing Cape Cod area, to be coordinated with programs of Cape Cod Community College.

Governance and Administration

In a merger between Massachusetts Maritime Academy and Southeastern Massachusetts University, the Academy would become a college of the University, under the governance of the University's president and trustees. The SMU Board of Trustees should be expanded to assure a voice for ongoing Maritime interests, perhaps by adding two members at least one of whom would, until some specified date, be an MMA alumnus. In addition, a board of visitors to the College, or to the University's marine programs generally, should be established to

advise the president and trustees. Such a panel, composed of individuals from outside SMU knowledgeable in maritime fields, would fulfill several valuable purposes. It would make specialized expertise available to the SMU administration, provide an informed "voice" for the marine enterprise within the University, and strengthen the College and University relationship with their maritime constituencies.

The College, like the other six colleges of the University (Arts & Sciences, Engineering, etc.), would be headed by a dean reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The faculty in maritime-related departments would remain within the Maritime College; the affiliation of faculty teaching core curriculum courses must be determined as part of a detailed implementation plan, in consultation with the departments and individuals involved. A commandant of cadets would be responsible for cadet discipline and would coordinate delivery of special student services to the corps. The commandant would be uniformed, and the dean might be; as is currently the case at the Academy, uniforms would be optional for faculty in non-maritime fields.

Maintenance of a cadet corps within the University implies a need for some separate student support services for the maritime program. These would include specialized academic counseling and disciplinary procedures, as well as career placement. These services, though they might be placed within the University-wide student services structure, would have to be staffed by specialists attuned to their distinctive clientele. At the same

time, students would have access to a more comprehensive range of expertise and services from the University than are now available at the Academy. Similarly, it appears that effective student recruitment for the maritime program would require not an entire separate admissions staff, but some "dedicated" staffing within the admissions office.

Collective Bargaining Considerations

The proposed merger would make the Maritime Academy a part of Southeastern Massachusetts University; as the University, much the larger of the two institutions, would be the ongoing entity, current Academy employees would presumably be consolidated into its collective bargaining units. The resolution of collective bargaining issues arising from the merger must be left to negotiations between the Regents and the unions involved, with the University and the Academy parties to the discussion. At this stage, we can only review in general terms the probable context of those negotiations.

The Maritime Academy faculty are members of the Massachusetts State College Association, affiliated with the Massachusetts Teachers Association/National Education Association; whereas SMU's faculty union is the American Federation of Teachers. (The University is the only AFT institution in our system.) Salary scales at SMU, which are relatively uniform by rank, are somewhat above those prevailing in the State Colleges. Administrators at each institution are in the same union as professors, though

under a separate contract. Clerical employees on both campuses are members of Coalition I (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees), which should facilitate consolidation of these units. The Academy's trade and maintenance workers are also in Coalition I, while SMU's are affiliated with the National Association of Government Employees; the two contracts are substantially similar, however.

Academy faculty and other employees working in specifically maritime-related positions are covered by special provisions of the applicable contracts. To the extent that their separate status is maintained in the transfer of bargaining units, consolidation will probably be easier. Similarly, the creation of a new college of the University, and the maintenance of maritime departments, may mitigate issues of seniority status which are among the more likely points of contention in a merger.

Financial Impact

Although there are academic considerations that favor a merger of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy and Southeastern Massachusetts University, it is all too obvious that the principal rationale for a consolidation in the public mind, and the main precipitating factor of much recent attention to the Academy's future, is the possibility of achieving financial savings. In a fiscal climate such as that in which the Commonwealth now finds itself, short-term and long-term financial considerations must be clearly differentiated. An MMA-SMU merger will produce long-term savings in several senses:

- o Eventual efficiencies arising from consolidation of existing functions that may be duplicated at present; examples might be administrative, maintenance, or liberal arts faculty positions;
- o Avoidance of future duplication, such as might arise in broadening MMA's program array;
- o Improved return on existing investments through fuller use of available resources, as by placing the Coastal Zone Laboratory or continuing education programs on the Buzzards Bay campus, by recruitment of maritime students through SMU admissions programs;
- o Exploitation of economies of scale to permit maintenance of specialized programs at reasonable cost;
- o Development of new programs promising high return on investment for the Commonwealth in marine-related fields.

Short-term savings, whether from a merger or an outright closure of the Academy, are much more problematic. Because the MMA programs are highly specialized and unique in the Commonwealth, and because they have high fixed costs, immediate large-scale savings could be realized only by their termination, leaving currently enrolled students unable to complete their

educations. Any reduction in staffing through layoffs could incur one-time costs ("buy-outs," etc.) that offset first-year fiscal benefits. Clearly a well-thought-out and suitably cold-blooded retrenchment could help alleviate the state's cash-flow problem even in the first year, but the actual amount of potential savings cannot be predicted with any accuracy -- although experience tells us that preliminary estimates are generally too optimistic.

In addition, single-minded concern with immediate benefits can lead to long-term difficulties, inefficiencies, and even financial costs. In a consolidation, the extreme pressure of financial exigency creates an atmosphere in which sensitivity to institutional traditions and individual circumstances is too easily lost, resulting in a permanent structure beset by built-in internal conflicts. Accommodations that work in "year one" may sacrifice valuable assets, narrowing future prospects. In the case of the merger under consideration here, we would be particularly concerned that a realistic budget be provided for continuation of maritime programs within the SMU appropriation; there is no reasonable justification for shifting any part of this added burden to the already hard-pressed University budget.

Regional Possibilities

The possibility of some form of affiliation with one (or more) of the other maritime academies, a persistent element in discussions of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy's future, is

only secondarily relevant to the Regents' charge for this report. Any far-reaching arrangement of that kind, moreover, would have to be established through extensive and exceedingly complex interstate negotiations; the subject is even more speculative than the collective bargaining situation reviewed earlier, as in this instance none of the parties is under any compulsion to undertake discussions. It appears, nevertheless, that a merger of the Academy into SMU would preclude neither further consideration of this option, nor implementation of consortial relationships with similar schools in other states.

There are two state maritime academies, apart from MMA, in the northeastern United States. The Maine Maritime Academy, in Castine, is somewhat smaller than MMA, but offers a broader range of marine-related baccalaureate fields (seven majors) as well as associate and master's degree programs. The State University of New York Maritime College at Fort Schuyler, in the Bronx, is a larger institution with a program array that extends beyond maritime subjects, including the MBA. The United States Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point, New York enrolls 800 midshipmen in a tightly structured bachelor's degree program. Its graduates are bound by a five-year merchant marine service obligation. (The U.S. Coast Guard Academy, in New London, Connecticut, prepares officers for that service; unaffected by the vicissitudes of the maritime industry, it is in important respects more comparable to the other armed service academies than to the maritime schools.)

There are a number of areas in which consortial arrangements among maritime academies -- perhaps including those outside the

Northeast, in Michigan, Texas, and California, and even counterparts in other countries -- might be worth exploring. These include, for example, faculty exchanges, student exchanges and cross-registration, and sharing of unique facilities and resources. The Massachusetts program would probably be in a better posture to participate in such agreements as part of a general university than it would as a free-standing institution, because it would have more to offer to other participants. The current program, narrowly focused on traditional maritime courses, is substantially duplicated at other academies; the more specialized programs that would become possible within SMU would be more attractive to faculty and students from elsewhere. Additionally, the university context would improve the possibility of developing exchanges and working relationships outside the maritime training community as such, in marine-related fields such as engineering, oceanography, and transportation.

The implications of regional or national maritime affiliation, like those of the merger concept itself, are much clearer in terms of potential benefits than of immediate savings. The most drastic economizing strategy, outright merger with an out-of-state academy rather than with SMU, is in the present situation tantamount to closure of the Academy; it is outside the scope of this paper, and beyond the range of options that the Board of Regents has chosen to consider. Another proposal to achieve major savings involves sharing a training vessel with another academy, thus spreading the burden of a large fixed cost.

The Regents' consultant team reported that it would be impracticable to meet the present federal training requirements for shipboard service under this arrangement; but they also noted that the Academy should develop contingency plans for a change in the law and a reduction in the federal subsidy.

Consortial affiliations among institutions in the maritime education field have obvious advantages under any circumstances. In the event of continued depression in maritime industries, or of a further reduction in federal support, consortiums or consolidations may be necessary to maintain the viability of professional maritime programs. A merger of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy with Southeastern Massachusetts University would not prevent the consummation of such arrangements, and would in some respects enhance the prospects for interinstitutional cooperation.

12/4/89 AM

